

BOARD OF DESIGN REVIEW MINUTES

May 22, 2002

CALL TO ORDER: Chairman Mimi Doukas called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. in the Beaverton City Hall Council Chambers at 4755 SW Griffith Drive.

ROLL CALL: Present were Chairman Mimi Doukas; Board Members Hal Beighley, Ronald Nardoza, Jennifer Shipley, and Stewart Straus. Board Members Cecilia Antonio and Jessica Weathers were excused.

Senior Planner Kevin Snyder, Consultant John Spencer, and Recording Secretary Sandra Pearson represented staff.

VISITORS:

Chairman Doukas read the format for the meeting and asked if any member of the audience wished to address the Board on any non-agenda item. There was no response.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

The minutes of May 1, 2003, as written, were submitted. Chairman Doukas asked if there were any changes or corrections. Mr. Straus **MOVED** and Mr. Beighley **SECONDED** a motion that the minutes be adopted as written and submitted.

The question was called and the motion **CARRIED** unanimously, with the exception of Ms. Doukas, Mr. Nardoza, and Ms. Shipley, who abstained.

STAFF COMMUNICATION:

WORK SESSION:

Work session with staff to review the commercial and industrial elements of the Design Review Process Update. The Design Review Process Update process is developing potential updates to the current Development Code design review process and approval criteria. The Code Review Advisory Committee (CRAC), which is a broad-based community advisory body, has been advising staff on this project, which began in December 2002.

Observing that the last Work Session had ended with a discussion of residential standards, Consultant John Spencer of *Spencer & Kupper* questioned whether the Board had any questions regarding these issues.

Ms. Shipley pointed out that while the draft standards and guidelines describe a specific tree and shrub pattern, her personal preference involves a design that provides some variety and that is not so uniform.

Senior Planner Kevin Snyder described the challenges of creating a good design while also providing the necessary buffering impact, and explained the rationale involved in uniformity.

Ms. Shipley expressed her opinion that it is possible to install the groupings of Evergreens closer while still creating an adequate buffer, suggesting the possibility of concentrating the plant material in one area.

Mr. Straus suggested the possibility of requiring one tree or shrub for every 30 feet and allowing the spacing to be determined by the design, adding that the design should be determined by what the Board wishes to achieve, rather than for the convenience of staff.

Mr. Snyder pointed out that the standards should simplify issues for staff as well as providing certainty for customers.

Mr. Straus mentioned that stringent criteria would eliminate all design creativity, adding that he is concerned with the lack of flexibility.

Ms. Shipley mentioned that a deciduous tree provides far more buffering than arborvitae.

Mr. Snyder explained that it is necessary to establish what he referred to as the intent for the reasonable spacing of trees, adding that it would be up to the applicant to determine how to achieve this.

Mr. Straus noted that this reasonable spacing could be better achieved with combinations of plant material, rather than the standard "30-inches on center".

Agreeing that a combination is preferable, Mr. Snyder pointed out that it is difficult to anticipate and accommodate all potential situations clearly and objectively.

Emphasizing that this involves a balancing act, Mr. Straus mentioned that regulations that are too loose or too tight will not achieve the desired result.

DRAFT COMMERCIAL PRINCIPLES, STANDARDS AND GUIDELINES

COMMERCIAL BUILDING DESIGN

Mr. Straus expressed his objection to limiting the length of a building.

Chairman Doukas observed that she thought this restriction had been eliminated.

Mr. Spencer explained that the 330-foot length originates with transportation standards, noting that Metro requires a pedestrian connection every 330-feet.

Mr. Straus expressed his opinion that this pedestrian connection can be achieved with a longer building.

Mr. Spencer pointed out that a longer building would require a greater level of review, noting that 330-feet may be inappropriate and that a standard City block is 200-feet in length.

Mr. Snyder stated that he understood that the Board was recommending that a building should be no more than 200-feet in length before it is broken up.

Mr. Straus observed that 200 feet could involve a significant change in a building plane, adding that he is unable to imagine why Metro would require a pedestrian connection every 330-feet.

Mr. Snyder mentioned difficulty with determining measuring points, adding that the Code Review Advisory Committee (CRAC) had focused on the street as a measuring point.

Mr. Straus expressed concern with the end result.

Mr. Straus pointed out that size alone should not determine the level of review.

Mr. Snyder referred to the issue of sensitivity.

Chairman Doukas discussed the issue of guidelines versus standards.

Expressing his opinion that historically 90% of the past Board of Design Review projects should involve Type 2 applications, Mr. Straus expressed his opinion that some of the larger projects could be appropriately addressed through the Type 2 process as well.

Mr. Snyder noted that size and location are elements of the threshold

Observing that this document would address 90% of the proposals submitted, Ms. Doukas pointed out that the Board would be responsible for dealing with the remaining 10%. She explained that the conditions are designed to provide for conformance with the standards.

Mr. Snyder noted that when interpreting guidelines, the Board should rely upon standards and principles.

Mr. Straus mentioned that the less sophisticated developers would get the shorter end of the stick.

Ms. Doukas pointed out that some of the smaller proposals would not be reviewed by the Board, adding that at least the standards would now be clear.

COMMERCIAL CIRCULATION & PARKING

Ms. Shipley questioned why drive-through features of a service window are required to be internal and not permitted to face the street.

Mr. Spencer advised Ms. Shipley that this pertains to both access and viewing the drive-through from the street.

Observing that drive-through windows are a part of every day life, Chairman Doukas questioned whether it is really an issue for them to be visible from the street.

Mr. Straus mentioned that there are some buildings that serve only a drive-through purpose, without a park and enter element, such as the drive-through coffee stands. He pointed out that street frontages should not be dominated by parking areas.

Ms. Shipley discussed concerns with internal circulation and parking and evergreen shrubs.

Mr. Beighley reference the minimum mature height of 20 feet for a tree.

Mr. Snyder pointed out that staff had considered a mature height of 30 feet.

Mr. Straus expressed his opinion that a tree should provide a benefit of both width and height.

Ms. Shipley emphasized that a 20-foot tree with a decent spread should be limbed up.

Chairman Doukas clarified that CRAC is not happy with trees in the parking lots, observing that this involves a mess, necessitates maintenance, and creates a conflict with lighting.

Mr. Spencer suggested that the minimum mature height be increased from 20-feet to 25-feet.

Ms. Shipley agreed, observing that a 20-foot tree is ornamental, rather than shade.

Mr. Straus discussed mature height versus planting height of trees and shrubs, adding that there should be separate standards for trees and shrubs and that the choices are fairly arbitrary.

Mr. Snyder suggested that there be a minimum requirement of two tree species, adding that some standards can be qualitative, rather than quantifiable.

8:21 p.m. – Ms. Shipley left.

Mr. Spencer pointed out that commercial lighting is basically the same as residential lighting.

Mr. Snyder announced that only two additional Work Sessions have been scheduled, on June 12, 2003, and June 26, 2003, adding that industrial, multiple use, and thresholds would be discussed at this time.

MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS:

The meeting adjourned at 8:28 p.m.